

Message from the President

We would like to express our sincere gratitude for your continued understanding and generous support of the activities of the Kajima Institute of International Peace.

In recent years, in the Message from the President portion of this annual report, I have expressed concerns about several developments: namely, the reversal of globalization in the U.S. and Europe driven by widening income inequality, the resulting economic slowdown and inflation—stagflation—and the rise of nationalist parties in advanced countries, ultimately threatening the collapse of the postwar international order. However, upon reflecting on Donald Trump's victory in the presidential election on November 5 last year, his cabinet appointments, and the first five months of governance under his second administration following the inauguration on January 20, I have reconsidered. I now believe that what we should be concerned about is not merely a backlash against globalization, but a regression—a return to a pre-modern era. By "pre-modern," I refer to an era prior to the Enlightenment—characterized economically by mercantilism, politically by absolute monarchy, and socially by the dominance of religion. More specifically, this would be the period before the first half of the 18th century.

In fact, when we look back at American history, we find precedents for such reactionary, regressive, and restorationist movements that sweep across the entire economic and social landscape. Moreover, historians

of the United States have reached a consensus that these movements have occurred not just once, but four times over the past 300 years, dating back to the colonial era. These are known as the Great Awakenings. Each of these movements, once ignited, tended to last for an average of about thirty years. If the second Trump administration is indeed a political manifestation of such a movement, it is likely that even after President Trump leaves office, future administrations with similar characteristics will continue to pursue similar policies. What follows is written with full awareness that it may be criticized for oversimplification or excessive certainty—but I have chosen to do so in order to bring into sharper relief the essence of the second Trump administration.

Let us begin by examining the policies of the second Trump administration. Its trade and investment policies appear to be rooted in the logic of 17th-century mercantilism—where exports that increase the national stock of gold are deemed good, and imports that reduce it are considered bad. In modern terms, this translates into a belief that exports which create jobs are good, while imports that reduce employment are bad. Tariffs are actively employed to reduce imports and shrink the trade deficit. However, it remains unclear whether the ultimate goal is to leverage reciprocal tariffs to negotiate better trade deals, or to encourage direct investment in U.S. manufacturing to create domestic jobs. Moreover, depending on market reactions—such

as those in the U.S. Treasury bond market—the administration has postponed the implementation of certain tariffs. Yet such uncertainty undermines investor confidence: without a clear outlook on future cash flows, risk premiums rise, returns fall, and investment incentives diminish. In addition, Trump frequently intervenes in the Federal Reserve—an institution meant to be independent—pressuring it to lower interest rates. This is ostensibly to weaken the dollar and boost export competitiveness. However, combining high tariffs on imports with a weak dollar risks triggering uncontrollable import inflation. In this way, Trump’s trade and economic policies lack internal coherence and appear to rely heavily on the instincts of a former businessman whose six companies went bankrupt—an approach that can be described as anti-intellectual.

In domestic affairs—particularly in governance and institutional policy—the behavior of the second Trump administration evokes the image of absolute monarchy, following the doctrine of the “unitary executive theory.” Specifically, the frequent use of executive orders and emergency declarations has hollowed out the legislative branch. The administration has not only ignored or defied rulings from state supreme courts and federal appellate courts that obstruct its policy implementation, but has even hinted at the dismissal of judges. The repeated issuance of arbitrary pardons also suggests an intent to undermine the judiciary. To be fair, Trump campaigned on a promise

to “drain the swamp,” aiming to purge or overthrow the entrenched political elite in Washington, including the media—so such behavior may be seen as consistent with that pledge. Regarding the judiciary, the Supreme Court currently holds a 6–3 conservative majority, with three of the conservative justices appointed by Trump himself. This may explain the administration’s apparent confidence in prevailing in cases that reach the Supreme Court, allowing it to maintain a façade of respect for judicial authority. However, the hollowing out of the legislature and the (at least temporary) weakening of the judiciary threaten the system of checks and balances, and suggest a concentration of power in the presidency that undermines the rule of law itself.

Furthermore, when examining the administration’s relationship with the media—often referred to as the “fourth branch of government”—it is evident that since the first Trump administration, there has been a prevailing belief that the entrenched political elite in Washington, the so-called “Deep State,” has colluded with mainstream media to disseminate massive falsehoods, or “fake news.” As a result, media outlets sympathetic to the administration are granted access to the president, while those that adhere to their watchdog role by scrutinizing power are subject to restrictions: denied access to press briefings, threatened with license revocation, targeted with massive lawsuits, and otherwise marginalized or silenced. With the checks and balances of the media, judiciary, and legislature being systematically dismantled,

one must ask: where is the Trump-led executive branch headed? Moreover, there are numerous instances of conflicts of interest, blurred lines between public and private roles, and abuses of power. Trump has refused to place his assets in escrow or a blind trust, instead allowing them to be managed by his family business. He has attended opening ceremonies for golf courses operated by his company and dinners related to cryptocurrency ventures. His sons, who run the family business, have been seen entering and exiting the White House, raising suspicions of insider trading. On official visits to Middle Eastern countries, he has brought along his son, who has reportedly brokered real estate deals during these trips. Such blatant disregard for conflicts of interest and the separation between public duty and private gain is reminiscent of the behavior typical of absolute monarchies.

In the realm of domestic policy, particularly social policy, the second Trump administration appears to be promoting measures that, on the surface, oppose “woke” culture and political correctness, but at a deeper level represent a reactionary retreat from Enlightenment and progressive ideals—toward a pre-modern era dominated by absolute monarchy and religious authority. Specifically, these policies include the establishment of a White House Office of Faith-Based Initiatives aimed at strengthening ties with various religious groups, especially Evangelicals; persistent intervention in universities, which are viewed as strongholds of the radical left; the rollback of DEI (diversity,

equity, and inclusion) initiatives in the public sector; withdrawal from the Paris Climate Agreement; and the loosening of environmental regulations. Among these, the interference in universities is particularly contradictory, as it undermines institutions that are the foundation of America's scientific and industrial competitiveness—thus conflicting directly with slogans like “America First” and “Make America Great Again” (MAGA). Trump frequently refers to his policies as “common sense politics,” a phrase that echoes the historical distrust and resentment toward intellectuals and experts identified by Richard Hofstadter in his seminal work *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*. These policies strongly reflect the values of Evangelical Christianity, which emphasizes the inerrancy of the Bible and the primacy of personal spiritual experience over rational or scholarly theology.

What should we make of the foreign policy declarations regarding the cession of Greenland, the transfer of the Panama Canal, and the annexation of Canada? Such proclamations are exceedingly rare in the modern era—especially since the establishment of international law in the early 17th century, following nearly a century of conflict between Catholics and Protestants after the Reformation. Since the adoption of the United Nations Charter in 1945, similar actions have been largely confined to authoritarian regimes, such as China's annexation of Tibet in 1951, its declaration of sovereignty over the South China Sea in 1992 (via its Maritime Law), Russia's annexation of Crimea in 2014, and its

claim over eastern Ukraine in 2022. These moves reflect a pre-modern, absolutist, and pre-Enlightenment worldview. In the case of the Israel– Hamas war, the Trump administration has tolerated Israel’s inhumane actions, likely influenced by the approximately 30 million Christian Zionists among Evangelicals. In contrast, the war between Ukraine and Russia—primarily a conflict between Eastern Orthodox Christians—has garnered less interest from Evangelicals, due to significant theological differences between Eastern Orthodoxy and Evangelicalism. Trump’s own lack of interest in foreign affairs, particularly regarding the Ukraine– Russia war, appears to mirror the Evangelical community’s limited concern, which in turn reflects the weak correlation between that issue and electoral support.

Having reviewed the second Trump administration’s economic, domestic (governance and social), and foreign policies, it is clear that despite internal inconsistencies within each policy domain and contradictions between them—for example, promoting industrial competitiveness while undermining universities, which are its foundation—these policies share a common character: they are reactionary, regressive, and restorationist. Mercantilism, absolute monarchy, and pre-modern governance (before the Enlightenment and the establishment of international law) were characteristic of European states prior to the early 17th century, and Trump’s policies appear to signal a return to that era.

Such reactionary and restorative movements are not unprecedented in American history. In fact, historians widely agree that similar movements have occurred four times over the past 300 years, dating back to the colonial period. These are known as the Great Awakenings—religious revival movements led by Evangelical Christians. According to Allen C. Guelzo, a distinguished historian at Princeton University, the Great Awakenings served as a means for America to confront and resolve cultural crises, such as the Civil War, industrialization, and the end of the Cold War. These movements interpreted societal crises as divine punishment for impiety, and proposed spiritual rebirth—being “born again”—as the path to redemption and a return to devout living. Eyewitnesses of the Second Great Awakening described gatherings held in forest clearings, where preachers delivered sermons day and night. Audiences, sometimes numbering up to 20,000, would kneel, weep, scream, convulse, faint, and plead for God’s forgiveness for their impiety, undergoing spiritual conversion. Why, then, did such movements arise?

The United States currently stands at the forefront of global science and technology, particularly in terms of university research, and as a result, American companies dominate the top rankings of global market capitalization. At the same time, since the arrival of the Puritans—who fled religious persecution in England and crossed the Atlantic to settle in North America—the U.S. has remained a nation where religion exerts

a far greater influence than in other advanced countries. This fact is often overlooked or little known among the general Japanese public, though it is well recognized among Japanese scholars of American studies, with numerous books published on the subject. It is customary for government officials, including the President, to place their hand on the Bible during inauguration ceremonies and to swear their oath with the phrase, “So help me God” (although Trump notably did not place his hand on the Bible during his second inauguration). Since 1957, the year after Congress officially adopted the national motto, U.S. dollar bills have carried the inscription “In God We Trust.” In the 119th Congress (Senate and House combined), only about 5% of the 532 members identified as unaffiliated or declined to state their religious affiliation, while approximately 55% identified as Protestant, 28% as Catholic, and 12% as other religions. Among the nine Supreme Court justices, six are Catholic, two are Protestant, and one is Jewish—none are unaffiliated or non-religious. Compared to the general population, where roughly 30% identify as unaffiliated or non-religious, both Congress and the Supreme Court exhibit a markedly higher level of religiosity. It would seem that being unaffiliated or non-religious poses a significant barrier to becoming a member of Congress or a Supreme Court justice.

Religion has played a profound role in shaping the course of major historical events in the United States. The Puritans, known as the Pilgrim Fathers, who laid the foundation for British settlement in North

America, saw themselves as the Israelites chosen by God in the Book of Exodus. Persecuted under the tyranny of the English crown, they likened their plight to that of the Israelites enslaved in Egypt. Just as the Israelites crossed the Red Sea, the Puritans crossed the Atlantic Ocean, believing they had arrived not in Canaan but in the Massachusetts Bay—their promised land. This narrative of religious exile and divine mission was later echoed by the Mormon pioneers who, fleeing persecution, crossed the prairies to establish Salt Lake City. The American Revolutionary War (1775–1783) was fought not only under the banner of “no taxation without representation,” but also as a quest for “the sacred cause of liberty,” including religious freedom from the Anglican Church. The Civil War (1861–1865) was framed by both the North and South as a moral battle between good and evil, each side citing different interpretations of the Bible to justify their stance on slavery. President Abraham Lincoln reportedly told his cabinet that he had declared emancipation in obedience to the voice of God, and believed the war was divine punishment for 250 years of slavery. The Cold War (1945–1991) was portrayed as a struggle between godless communist regimes and a God-fearing America. Similarly, the War on Terror (2001–2021) was explicitly framed by Evangelical President George W. Bush as a battle between good and evil. Thus, throughout American history, major national crises have been shaped not only by economic interests and political rivalries, but also by a deeply religious

narrative of moral conflict. When we reflect on the historical dimension of the United States as a religious nation, the four Great Awakenings stand out as particularly distinctive and symbolic events. While other countries have experienced religious revival movements—such as Methodism in Britain, Pietism in Germany, the Revival Movement in South Korea, and Pentecostalism in Brazil—the scale, impact, and recurrence of such movements in the United States are unparalleled.

The American writer Mark Twain is often credited with saying, “History doesn’t repeat itself, but it often rhymes.” This observation aptly applies to the Great Awakenings. Each occurrence took place under different circumstances—America’s global standing, its political leadership, its acceptance of science and technology, and the level of political participation among African Americans, youth, and women all varied. The First Great Awakening occurred while America was still a colony. During the Second, the nation had gained independence, and a planter oligarchy dominated politics, while the Louisiana Purchase had doubled the country’s territory (though the population increased by only about 10%). By the time of the Third Great Awakening, the U.S. had largely reached its current territorial boundaries and the frontier had disappeared (following the annexation of Texas, the Mexican Cession, and the Gadsden Purchase, which brought about a modest 2% population increase). This period also saw the emergence of Darwin’s

theory of evolution—an idea Evangelicals, who viewed the Bible as the inerrant word of God, found deeply troubling—alongside rapid industrialization and urbanization. The Fourth Great Awakening unfolded as the United States, positioned as the leader of the democratic world, competed for global dominance with the Soviet Union, the leader of the communist bloc. Domestically, the country was roiled by the civil rights movement, anti-war protests, and the women’s liberation movement. Despite these differences, each Great Awakening “rhymed” in one crucial respect: they were all revivalist movements led by Evangelical Christians. Evangelicals base their beliefs on the inerrancy of the Bible and, from the moment of conversion—which they distinguish from infant baptism and require to be a conscious act of repentance for a previously faithless life—they prioritize spiritual experience and a personal relationship with God over the logical theology developed by figures such as St. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas. As a result, their approach is experiential but not logical, spiritual but not rational. In other words, it tends toward anti-rationalism, anti-intellectualism, and anti-scientific thinking. What is crucial here is not that Evangelicalism happened to be irrational or unscientific, but that it was fundamentally opposed to reason, intellect, and science. The following table summarizes the four Great Awakenings in terms of their starting and ending years, duration, intervals between each movement, and the crises—such as key issues and waves of immigration—that are believed to have triggered their emergence.

Awakening	Period (Years)	Interval Since Previous	Likely Causes (Key Issues & Immigration)
1st	1730s– 1740s (10 yrs.)	—	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rise of Enlightenment and rationalism undermining religious authority (Anglican Church) • Conflict between Anglican colonial elites and diverse religious refugees, indentured servants, and immigrant laborers • 1706: Union of England and Scotland led to Anglican persecution of Presbyterian Scots-Irish (Ulster), prompting mass immigration
2nd	1790s– 1830s (40 yrs.)	50 yrs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distraction from religion due to the Revolutionary War (1775–1783) • Enlightenment-based founding documents lacking reference to God: U.S. Constitution (1789), First Amendment (1791)

Awakening	Period (Years)	Interval Since Previous	Likely Causes (Key Issues & Immigration)
2nd	1790s–1830s (40 yrs.)	50 yrs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Westward expansion: Louisiana Purchase (1803), Florida Cession (1819) brought in French and Spanish Catholics • Resentment toward established elites • Removal of property requirements in state election laws enabled universal white male suffrage
3rd	1850s–1900s (50 yrs.)	20 yrs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irish Potato Famine (1845–1849) led to influx of Catholic Irish immigrants • Mexican-American War (1846–1848) brought Catholic Mexicans and indigenous non-Christians into U.S. territory • 1859: Darwin's <i>Origin of Species</i> challenged biblical literalism • Civil War (1861–1865)

Awakening	Period (Years)	Interval Since Previous	Likely Causes (Key Issues & Immigration)
3rd	1850s– 1900s (50 yrs.)	20 yrs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrialization and urbanization widened wealth gaps • Pogroms in Russia (1881–1884) led to Eastern European Jewish immigration • Territorial expansion: Alaska Purchase (1867), annexation of Hawaii and acquisition of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines (1898)
4th	1860s– 1980s (20 yrs.)	60 yrs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cold War against godless communist regimes • Backlash against counterculture: civil rights movement, Roe v. Wade, spread of contraceptives and premarital sex, drug abuse, Vietnam War protests, environmentalism, and women's liberation

There is ongoing debate over whether a Fifth Great Awakening is currently underway under the second Trump administration. However, considering that the previous four Great Awakenings emerged during times of social crisis in the United States—at pivotal moments of historical and technological transition, and following large waves of non-Protestant immigration—it seems plausible that the conditions for another such movement are now ripe. This is especially true given the series of critical events that unfolded in the 2000s and 2010s, which appear to have deepened cultural divisions and intensified societal fragmentation.

1. **2000–2010:** Deindustrialization and job losses due to globalization (e.g., China’s accession to the WTO in 2001)
2. **2001:** The deadliest terrorist attack on U.S. soil—9/11, resulting in approximately 3,000 deaths
3. **2002–2004:** Inhumane actions by the U.S. during the War on Terror, including abuses at Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib prison
4. **2003:** Invasion of Iraq despite the absence of weapons of mass destruction
5. **2004:** Erosion of U.S. leadership credibility internationally and declining public trust in political leaders and government domestically
6. **2004:** Surge in PTSD cases among veterans returning from the War on Terror

7. **2007–2012:** Increase in opioid-related deaths among veterans who joined the military due to lack of employment and developed PTSD
8. **2008–2011:** The Lehman Shock and subsequent movements such as Occupy Wall Street, the 99% movement, and the Tea Party
9. **2009:** Election of Barack Obama, the first Black president of the United States
10. **2014–2020:** Racial tensions symbolized by the rise of the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement
11. **2000s–2010s:** Massive influx of legal and illegal immigrants from Latin America, many of whom are Catholic

If the Fifth Great Awakening movement is indeed underway, then the seemingly whimsical, unpredictable, and unnecessarily uncertainty-inducing policies of the Trump II administration begin to make coherent sense. That is, they are remarkably consistent in their tendencies—characteristic of an evangelical revival movement—as reactionary, regressive, restorationist, anti-modern, anti-scientific, anti-Enlightenment (anti-rational), anti-intellectual (anti-expert and anti-elite), anti-liberal (anti-tolerance), and anti-progressive (opposed to social justice). In this light, Trump himself may be seen not as the originator but merely a symbol riding the wave of the Fifth Great Awakening. The true driving force of the movement could be considered the evangelical

base, the white working-class voters with high school education, farmers, and rural voters—what are often referred to as “the forgotten people” or, in Nancy Isenberg’s terms, “White Trash.” Trump’s genius lies in his recognition of this wave and his insight that riding it could lead him to the presidency. Of course, he possesses the charisma of a reality TV star, and during the presidential campaign, he even survived an assassination attempt. Evangelical supporters may have interpreted his survival as “God’s will” (“God has a plan”)—that God protected him to become president and restore America as a great divine kingdom. As a result, evangelical support likely intensified further. Moreover, it is said that among Latinos—who now make up 19% of the U.S. population, surpassing African Americans—and across Latin America, there is a growing trend of conversion from Catholicism to Protestantism, including evangelical denominations. The rise of evangelicalism in the U.S. appears poised to continue.

In any case, as previously noted, if the Trump administration is the political manifestation of the Fifth Great Awakening, then its mercantilist, absolutist, anti-Enlightenment, and anti-international law policies may persist for about 30 years, judging from historical precedent. Against such a deliberately ideological administration, rational, rule-of-law-based, Enlightenment or progressive arguments are likely to be met with hostility. We may have no choice but to wait until the nation, exhausted

by the awakening, falls back into slumber. At that point, it may be reborn and return once again as the “world’s policeman.”

Of course, the idea that the Trump II administration is the political embodiment of the Fifth Great Awakening is merely one hypothesis. Another hypothesis posits that politics and economics swing like a pendulum between globalization and bloc-formation (isolationism). For example, the bloc formation rooted in the Age of Exploration and imperialism shifted toward globalization with the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846, reverted to bloc formation after the Great Depression in 1929, returned to globalization with the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 (end of the Cold War), and swung back to bloc formation (nationalism) following the 2008 World Financial Crisis. There is also a theory that economic leadership oscillates between the market and the government. That is, from government-led mercantilism before the Corn Laws to the market (as captured brilliantly by Adam Smith’s “invisible hand”), then back to government-led economics based on John Maynard Keynes’ macroeconomic theory after the Great Depression, then to market-led economics inspired by Friedrich von Hayek or Milton Friedman following the stagflation caused by the oil crisis, and finally back to government leadership after the World Financial Crisis. However, the author attempts to grasp the essence of the Trump II administration by focusing on religion, which lies deeper than economics, politics, society,

or ideology.

How, then, will China—or Xi Jinping—respond to such a United States? With the 2018 constitutional amendment abolishing presidential term limits, and assuming no health issues, Xi may believe that “time is on his side.” Therefore, it is likely that China will refrain from any major moves until the unpredictable Trump completes his term. Meanwhile, as Trump widens cracks in America’s traditional alliances, China will likely focus on exporting products to BRICS+ countries, Southeast Asia, Latin America, and Africa—regions where demand remains. This is because domestic demand is expected to remain sluggish due to the collapse of the real estate bubble. It has been four years since the major real estate developer Evergrande defaulted in 2021, but as with Japan’s post-bubble cleanup (non-performing loan disposal), China’s response appears slow and piecemeal. In Japan’s case, six years after land prices began falling, Hokkaido Takushoku Bank collapsed and Yamaichi Securities voluntarily shut down—delays and cover-ups were no longer viable. Twelve years after the decline of land prices began, public funds were injected into Resona Bank, marking the end of the cleanup. However, China’s real estate bubble involves not only developers and financial institutions but also local governments via financing platforms. Combined with media restrictions, this suggests that the cleanup will take even longer than Japan’s. In the meantime, China will rely on

external demand to support its economy. But if it continues exporting to developing countries for over a decade, it risks facing trade friction similar to that with advanced economies. Managing the economy under such conditions will be extremely difficult.

Japan, under a minority ruling coalition, finds it hard to implement bold and effective policies. The unresolved “money and politics” issue makes it difficult to break free from minority rule. While a change in government is possible, any new administration will likely be a fragile coalition. Moreover, there are still no signs of recovery from over 30 years of economic stagnation. Yet, amid this stagnation, Japan must now confront the most challenging task in the postwar era: formulating security, foreign, and economic policies for a world without U.S. leadership. Europe seems to have sensed the situation in the U.S. and has begun moving toward autonomous security. Japan must urgently follow suit. However, given the weakness of political leadership, there are natural limits to what can be done—this may be the time for Track 2 diplomacy to step in.

Although this “Greeting” was intended to reflect on fiscal year 2024 and explain the background of our new research initiatives, it has instead become a forecast of the Trump II administration and U.S. politics. Nevertheless, in fiscal year 2024, which marks the 58th anniversary of our foundation, the following five research groups were launched:

- **Lithuania Diplomacy and Security Workshop** (Chair: Nobukatsu Kanehara, Member of the Board of Trustees, Kajima Institute of International Peace), jointly with the Institute for Security & Development Policy (Sweden) and Prospect Foundation (Taiwan)
- **Workshop on Comparative Study of Legal Systems, Local Governments, and Accounting Standards Regarding Climate Change** (Chair: Masayuki Komatsu, Representative Director, Institute for Comprehensive Ecosystem Research), jointly with ISDP (Sweden)
- **Natural Circulating Water and Nature-based Solutions Workshop** (Chair: Masayuki Komatsu, Institute for Comprehensive Ecosystem Research)
- **New Era Vision Workshop II** (Chair: Zentaro Kamei, Chief Researcher, PHP Research Institute), jointly with PHP Research Institute
- **China Rebalancing Workshop** (Chair: Yuya Watase, Visiting Fellow, Waseda University Institute of Public Policy)

Meanwhile, the following six research groups have completed their work and achieved their intended outcomes:

- **Lithuania Diplomacy and Security Workshop** (Chair: Nobukatsu Kanehara, Member of the Board of Trustees, Kajima Institute of International Peace), presented results at the February 3 Diplomacy Workshop

- **Workshop on the Diplomatic Power of Small States** (Chair: Prof. Takeshi Sekiyama, Kyoto University Graduate School of Advanced Integrated Studies in Human Survivability), published *“Strategies of Money-Making Small States: What Japan Can Learn from Six Successful Countries”* (Kobunsha Shinsho, May 21), with results to be presented on July 11 at Diplomacy Workshop
- **Workshop on Reconstructing National-Local Relations** (Chair: Prof. Hideaki Tanaka, Meiji University Graduate School of Public Policy), published *“Population Halving Shock: New Regional Strategies”* (Nikkei Publishing, June 25), with results to be presented on September 11 at Diplomacy Workshop
- **Japan-India Soft Power Workshop** (Chair: Nobuyuki Hiraizumi, President, Kajima Institute of International Peace), jointly with India Foundation; publication on Japan-India relations forthcoming from India Foundation
- **Liberal International Order Workshop** (Chair: Nobukatsu Kanehara, Member of the Board of Trustees), jointly with ISDP (Sweden); policy recommendations in preparation
- **Japan-India-Europe Supply Chain Restructuring Workshop** (Chair: Prof. Takeshi Sekiyama, Kyoto University), jointly with ISDP (Sweden); policy recommendations in preparation

Lastly, we are pleased to welcome the following two individuals as new trustees, succeeding Mr. Sakutaro Tanino and Mr. Masao Oka, who stepped down last year:

- **Ms. Misako Kaji**, former Ambassador to Croatia
- **Mr. Iichiro Shikata**, former Director of Sales, Kajima Corporation

We also extend our heartfelt gratitude to the following two directors who have stepped down after many years of guidance since the time of our late former president:

- **Mr. Masaki Seo**, former Ambassador to Norway, who introduced many younger diplomats as lecturers to our flagship Diplomacy Workshop
- **Mr. Tsutomu Tanaka**, former Vice Minister of the Economic Planning Agency, who established and chaired the *World History Reassessment Study Group* in response to our late president's belief that "the world history we learned in high school 50 years ago must be updated in light of new research and declassified information"

June 30, 2025

Nobuyuki Hiraizumi

President, Kajima Institute of International Peace